



Air Pollution Control District
San Luis Obispo County

June 4, 2013

Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County
Department of Planning & Building
Government Center
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo CA 93408

SUBJECT: APCD Comments Regarding Las Pilitas Quarry Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Thank you for including the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in the environmental review process. We have completed our review of the Las Pilitas Quarry Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), which proposes a quarry and related improvements that would occupy approximately 41 acres within two parcels that total 234 acres. The proposed project is within the Rural Lands land use category and is located on the north side of State Highway 58 and east of the Salinas River, approximately three miles northeast of the community of Santa Margarita. The applicant is requesting a 25 to 58 year timeframe for the mining operation and phased reclamation of the mined site, with a maximum annual production of 500,000 tons, a portion of which will be recycled asphalt and Portland cement concrete.

The following are APCD comments that are pertinent to this project.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As a commenting agency in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process for a project, the APCD assesses air pollution impacts from both the construction and operational phases of a project, with separate significant thresholds for each. The APCD assessed this project by assuming all emissions are from the operational phase. **Please address the action items contained in this letter, with special attention to items that are highlighted by bold and underlined text.**

APCD's goal is to accurately quantify the project's impact to ozone formation, particulate matter (PM), greenhouse gases and health risk impacts from the project's operations (on-site equipment and truck trips) and clearly define mitigation measures that ensure these projects are below thresholds of significance. After a review of this DEIR, the APCD was

unable to confirm the exact assumptions and formulas that were used to calculate the air quality impacts of this project. This information is necessary to ensure the DEIR fully categorizes all the emissions associated with this project. **APCD recommends that the EIR clearly state all assumptions used for calculating emissions. In addition, prior to finalizing the EIR, all assumptions, emission factors and supporting calculations (e.g., spreadsheets, CalEEMod reports, etc.) need to be provided to the APCD to enable review and verification of the calculations.**

PROJECT SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Documentation of assumptions:

The APCD assessment of the DEIR cannot be finalized without complete information on assumptions used for emissions calculations, modeling and the health risk assessment. **The EIR should provide an expanded explanation as to what assumptions were used for the emissions calculations, modeling and health risk assessment, as discussed in comments 1 to 17 below:**

ASSUMPTIONS FOR CALCULATIONS IN EIR:

1. The APCD recommends that the EIR include a section on the assumptions used for emissions calculations, modeling and health risk assessment. The APCD recommends that this section include a table listing all assumptions (e.g., trip length, trucks per day, emission factors, etc.).
2. The EIR should provide an analysis of both the daily and annual operations (i.e., on-site and off-site emissions). Explain what throughput was assumed for the calculations (was it maximum permitted, daily, annual, average?).
3. The EIR should identify the truck trip rate assumption that was used in the calculations. From a review of Appendix D, it appears that the assumption was 273 trips per day. The EIR also indicates that 800 trips per day are possible. Assumptions of 273 trips per day and 800 trips per day differ considerably from a typical scenario. Quantify the different scenarios for reasonable worst case, daily and annual operations.
4. Quantify the operational air quality impacts when the mine output is at an average daily output and at maximum capacity. With maximum permitted capacity of 500,000 tons per year, what scenarios will allow 273 truck trips per day, 800 truck trips per day, vs. an average number of trips per day? Quantify daily and annual reasonable worst case emissions and compare them to the APCD's operational daily and annual thresholds.
5. Explain what unmitigated and mitigated operational phase equipment and emission factors were assumed in the calculations. Justify why these emission factors are appropriate. Assumptions that are included in the mitigated scenario need to be included in the conditionals of approval to ensure full implementation and compliance with the EIR.
6. From a review of Appendix D, it appears that a truck trip length of 25 miles was used. Please provide justification for this assumption. Indicate what markets were assumed for transport of material. Provide more detail about what part of SLO County is expected to receive the material and indicate whether trips originate or terminate outside of SLO County. Quantify the air quality impacts for the assumed truck trips.

7. Provide more explanation about the scenarios where the trucks will transport recycled material to the project site and leave with aggregate material. Each scenario should be evaluated in the EIR and the project should be conditioned to ensure calculations clearly represent an operational scenario that is enforceable.
8. Indicate whether any truck staging areas are included in the emissions analysis. If it is assumed, then indicate the location and the idling assumptions that were used.
9. Include air quality impact analysis for alternative haul routes. Quantify and discuss whether the air quality is improved by the alternate routes and do the alternatives make air quality worse in some areas.
10. From the information provided in the DEIR, it is not clear whether the emissions from the truck trips associated with recycled materials and processing of recycled materials are included in the calculations. Describe the air quality impact from bringing recycled material on-site for processing. Quantify the air quality impacts of processing or cleaning this material. Quantify the impacts from removing any debris (metal, wood, asphalt, or other waste material). Indicate the assumption for volume of recycled material. Will recycled material be processed elsewhere - washed elsewhere or on-site? This project scenario will likely also impact fugitive dust emissions.
11. Greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts need to be quantified for the entire operational impact, including the on and off-site emission sources (off-road and on-road equipment) including any operation emissions from processing recycled materials or making Portland cement. Section 4.4 of the EIR should be updated to include a breakout of the GHG emissions that result from on and off-site emission sources. From a review of spreadsheets in Appendix D, it appears that the aggregate and recycling plant are electrified. If this is the case, this condition should be included in the conditions of approval. All emissions must be calculated and compared to the APCD's GHG threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e/yr. The DEIR includes a reference to the SCAQMD GHG screening threshold. Please remove the reference to the SCAQMD threshold and refer to the SLOCoPCD threshold.

COMMENTS LISTED BY PAGE NUMBER:

12. **Page 2-8**, 50 percent backhauling assumption: As stated in Section 2.3.3, Trip Generation and Truck Traffic, half of the truck trips hauling recycled material will leave the site containing aggregate. This was a key limiting assumption in calculating the air quality impacts from truck trip operations. The project should be conditioned to ensure calculations clearly represent an operational scenario that is enforceable.
13. **Page 2-9**, second paragraph: The DEIR indicates that "Up to 800 truck trips may be anticipated for a large project". It is unclear whether the maximum of 800 truck trips was evaluated in any of the emission calculations. The EIR should state how many 'large projects' are assumed each year for this project and the EIR should calculate the maximum daily emissions for those instances. In addition, the County's permit conditions of approval need to clearly identify the maximum number of trips that are allowed to on a daily basis.
14. **Page 4.3-12 & Appendix D, page 32, section 6.4**: The discussion on Toxic Air Contaminant Regulations should be expanded to include Silica, Trace Metals and Naturally Occurring Asbestos. Please provide additional information on these compounds - why they are a health concern, what mining activities result in health impacts from these compounds.

15. **Page 4.3-24, 25:** Impacts from mitigation measures MM AQ 1a and MM AQ 1b have been deemed "Significant and not mitigated" in the DEIR. The APCD does not agree with this classification. As seen in a number of approved projects throughout SLO County, off-site mitigation can be incorporated to reduce the project emissions below a level of significance. The Residual Impact for AQ-1a should be changed to Class II, "Significant but mitigable." Other mitigation measures to include in AQ-1a are the following: 1) limit daily number of truck trips or on-site hours of operation, 2) "No Idling" restrictions (as currently stated in AQ 1a, 5-minute idling is what is required by the State Air Resources Board, reducing the idling time below the state 5 minutes would further reduce air quality impacts of this project), 3) Electrification of equipment and limits on hours of operation, and 4) Development of an APCD approved comprehensive Activity Management Plan that identifies the specific mitigation measures that the applicant is committed to implementing (e.g., identify equipment that meets Tier 4 standards, repowered engines or installed verified diesel emission control strategies).
16. **Page 4.3-28, 29:** Impact AQ -1b indicates that the residual impact is "Significant and not mitigated". With mitigation measures as listed and required by the APCD CEQA Handbook, the impact becomes Class II, "Significant but mitigable". In addition, this section should be expanded to include a reference to APCD rules regarding opacity and nuisance (Rules 401 and 402 respectfully). Complete implementation of the mitigation measures shall manage fugitive dust emissions such that they do not exceed the APCD 20% opacity limit (APCD Rule 401) from any source project on-site. As defined in APCD's Rule 402, a person shall not discharge, from any source whatsoever, such quantities of air contaminant or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or public, or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. .
17. **Page 4.3-33:** Risk values for individual receptors in Appendix D, Section 6.4, Table 13 are different than those listed in Table 4.3-9 in the main report – please make corrections so that the risk values are consistent.
18. **Page 4.3-33:** The mitigation measure MMAQ-2a states that mitigation measure AQ-1a serves as adequate mitigation for Impact AQ-2a. The DEIR should clearly state and quantify how MM AQ-1a serves as adequate mitigation for AQ-2a Mitigation Measures for DPM emissions. See Section 3.8 of the APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, for other measures, including "No Idling" and Electrification. Indicate whether electrification for some on-site equipment has been assumed in the calculations, as it appears this could be the case from a review of Appendix D.

Health Risk Assessment

Appendix D: Technical limitations to Health Risk Assessment (HRA) calculations should be discussed in the main body of the EIR. The HRA uses Atascadero meteorological data from the APCD station, which is the closest available meteorological station data. The Atascadero wind rose provided in Appendix D, Figure 4 indicates the Atascadero meteorological conditions used in the modeling analysis are influenced by air flow along the Salinas River valley (a valley aligned approximately north-south). The meteorological conditions on the project site will be influenced by local terrain – which are a series of ridgelines aligned approximately east-west – a significantly different orientation

than the north-south aligned Salinas River valley. The narrative about the HRA results should discuss that the lines of equal risk are influenced by the difference in local meteorological conditions. Modeling with on-site meteorological data could provide different results. **The EIR should discuss the limitations of the analysis**, so the public understands the limitations of the information presented in the EIR.

Sensitive Receptors: In addition, were all residences and sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project included in the health risk analysis? **If any sensitive receptors were omitted in the analysis, they should be added and the analysis revised.**

Transportation and Circulation / Land Use Compatibility

Section 4.11 and Section 4.14 both discuss County objectives and policies for the Santa Margarita Community that promote alternative transportation modes such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian use. It is currently stated on page 4.11-12 that "most of these policies do not apply to or directly relate to the proposed quarry project." APCD does not agree with this statement and recommends modifications to the EIR to mitigate the truck impact to the community of Santa Margarita.

The discussion of pedestrian and cycling impacts should be expanded in the main body of the EIR to address traffic impact on the local community and air quality. These issues could be addressed in both the Traffic and Circulation and Land Use Sections. As defined in the APCD's Clean Air Plan's sections on transportation alternatives and land use strategies, the APCD fully supports programs that promote alternative transportation, such as Safe Routes to School and complete streets. Multi-modal design is crucial to providing safe, effective options to driving the private automobile, thus minimizing vehicle miles traveled and the associated exhaust emissions which account for over 50% of the County's air pollution. Public perception of less safe pedestrian or cycling conditions may cause Santa Margarita residents to increase reliance on motorized vehicles to transport children to school; where they may previously have walked or used a bicycle – which could impact local air quality. The EIR should address the potential for increased traffic on Avenue I in Santa Margarita if traffic backs up on Highway 58, which would impact the air quality in the community. If this occurs, residents (sensitive receptors) may be impacted by increased diesel particulate matter concentrations near residences.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me at 781-5912.

Sincerely,



Gary Arcemont
Air Quality Specialist
GJA/arr

cc: Tim Fuhs, Enforcement Division, APCD
Karen Brooks, Enforcement Division, APCD